

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/655,598	09/05/2003	Jorg Hager	48506-00009	5726
23767	7590 04/27/2006		EXAMINER	
PRESTON GATES ELLIS & ROUVELAS MEEDS LLP 1735 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW, SUITE 500			BABIC, CHRI	STOPHER M
WASHINGTON, DC 20006		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1637	

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/655,598	HAGER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
•	Christopher M. Babic	1637				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app						
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	L. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 Fe</u>	ebruary 2006.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 20-31 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 20-31 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 September 2003</u> is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the correction of the correction o	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See don is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary					
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da					

Art Unit: 1637

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The rejections of Claims 1-19 under second paragraph are moot in view of Applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The rejections of Claims 1-19 over Lin are moot in view of Applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The rejections of Claims 1-19 over Lin in view of Weissman are moot in view of Applicant's amendment.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory

Art Unit: 1637

double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

It is noted that only representative claims will be discussed.

1. Claims 20-31 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 10 of Hager (U.S. 6,887,666 B1).

Claim 10 of Hager ('661) recites a method comprising: (a) digesting separately nucleic acids from a mixture of at least two nucleic acid populations with at least one restriction enzyme; (b) ligating a blunt ended adaptor sequence to the restriction fragments resulting from the digestion in step (a); (c) amplifying adaptor-ligated restriction fragments generated in step (b) using an adaptor-specific primer to produce amplification products having different ends in respect to each population; (d) hybridizing the amplification products of step (c) from the different nucleic acid populations with each other to generate a mixture comprising homoduplexes and heteroduplexes; (e) eliminating blunt ended homoduplexes from heteroduplexes having forked ends by digesting the homoduplexes with an enzyme that specifically digests blunt ended double-stranded DNA fragments; (f) eliminating mismatched heteroduplexes by using mismatch repair enzymes; and (g) identifying, isolating or

separating fully-matched heteroduplexes, thereby identifying, isolating or separating nucleic acid fragments that are identical between said at least two nucleic acid populations; wherein said primer is labelled by a technique selected from the group consisting of adding a unique 5'-sequence to the primer.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are both drawn to the same general inventive concept of identification, isolation or separation of identical nucleic acid fragments from a mixture of at least two nucleic acid population. Claim 10 of Hager ('661) differs in scope only in that the 5' unique sequence is introduced through an amplification primer ('661) rather than directly through the original adaptor sequence as in Claim 1 of the instant application.

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to directly introduce a 5' unique sequence through the original adaptor sequence in order to circumvent the amplification step recited in Claim 10 of Hager ('661).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 20-31 are allowable over the prior art, but are rejected for other reasons discussed above. A search of the prior art revealed no reference teaching or fairly suggesting the methods of Claim 20. The closest prior art, Lin et al. (U.S. 5,871,927), teaches the isolation of desired *different* sequences from two DNA libraries further

Art Unit: 1637

comprising the digestion of single-stranded mismatched ends of tester-subtracter heterohybrids while *maintaining* blunt-ended tester-homohybrids.

Conclusion

Claims 20-31 are rejected. No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher M. Babic whose telephone number is 571-272-8507. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 571-272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

h m = 4/21/06

Page 6

Christopher M. Babic Patent Examiner

AU 1637

KENNETH R. HORLICK, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINED

4/24/06